

REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy extended by Examiner Nguyen-Ba and Supervisor Miller in a telephone interview with Applicants' Counsel on January 13, 2009, in connection with the non final Office Action mailed December 5, 2008. During the interview, Applicant's Counsel discussed with the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor language believed to distinguish the presently pending claims from the art cited.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has:

(1) indicated that certified copies of priority documents have not been received;  
and

(2) rejected claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 to Alexander et al. (hereinafter Alexander).

In connection with this Response, claims 1, 8 and 13 have been amended. No new subject matter has been added. Upon entry of the above amendments, claims 1-18 remain pending in the application.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Priority Documents

With respect to item (1), Applicants' Counsel explained that the petition for acceptance of an unintentionally delayed priority claim was granted by the Office of Petitions and mailed to Applicant on October 6, 2008 and that all the required documents appear to be received by the Office. Applicants' Counsel and Examiner agreed that the documents appear to be with the Office. As stated in the Interview Summary mailed on January 21, 2009, Applicants need not submit a copy of the priority document at this time.

35 U.S.C. § 102(a)

With respect to item (2), the Examiner has asserted that claims 1-18 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) by Alexander. In particular, the Examiner has noted

that the claims in the present invention may be read to cover the selection step in Alexander.

As discussed and agreed by the Examiner and the Examiner's Supervisor during the telephone interview with Applicants' Counsel on January 13, 2009, independent claims 1, 8, and 13 have been amended to include language believed to distinguish the presently pending claims from the art cited. In particular, independent claim 1 has been amended to now recite, among other things, that navigation over the second display portion replaces previously displayed data fields with a display of current data fields along the Z axis from the second display portion *absent any additional selection along the second display portion*.

Similarly, independent claim 8, as amended, now recites that navigation over the second display view replaces previously displayed data with a display of current data from the second display view along the third navigational axis *absent any additional selection along the second display portion*.

Likewise, independent claim 13, as amended, now recites that navigation over the second display view replaces previously displayed data in the first display view with a display of current data from the second display view along the Z axis *absent any additional selection along the second display portion*.

In other words, as the cursor moves over the second display portion, the data represented by data fields in the second display portion is displayed along the Z axis, replacing previously displayed data in the first display portion, without the need to first press a "select" button or a need to perform any additional selection. All that is required is moving the cursor over the second display portion which automatically pulls the new page reference from Z direction. Support for this amendment can be found from page 5 (line 26) to page 6 (line 5) of the present application.

In contrast, Alexander fails to teach or disclose an interactive graphics interface where navigation over the second display portion replaces previously displayed data fields in the first display portion with a display of current data fields along the Z axis from the second display portion *absent any additional selection*. Rather, Alexander teaches a system in which navigation requires two actions (i.e., two-step process). First

navigation requires selecting the cell labeled “Grid” by pressing arrow key 32.

Thereafter, navigation requires selecting the cell labeled “Sort” by pressing the select key 42 (Alexander, col. 4, lines 49-61). Thus, navigation in the Z axis can only be performed with a second selection step. In other words, Alexander teaches the performance of a second key press of, for instance, a “select” key.

Since Alexander fails or disclose an interactive graphics interface where navigation over the second display portion replaces previously displayed data fields in the first display portion with a display of current data fields along the Z axis from the second display portion absent any additional selection, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 8, and 13, as amended, are not anticipated by Alexander.

Claims 2-7 are dependent from independent claim 1, claims 9-12 are dependent from independent claim 8, and claims 14-18 are dependent from independent claim 13. As such, it follows that these claims are also not anticipated by Alexander.

#### Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are submitting for consideration two references in a concurrently filed Information Disclosure Statement. The references include:

1. “Method and apparatus for preparing and transmitting electronic program information and apparatus for producing electronic program guide from the electronic program information” (EP0921689A2); and

2. “Method and apparatus for finding and selecting a desired data item from a large schedule of data items using a TV set and a controller similar to a TV-remote-control” (EP0735749A2).

Applicants request that these references be considered by the Examiner.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims, as amended, are not anticipated by Alexander.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claims are in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the pending rejections, and early and favorable reconsideration are respectfully solicited. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecute and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (617) 310-6000.

Applicants do not believe that any additional fee is required in connection with this Response. However, should any extension or fee be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that such and any other fee required for timely consideration of this application be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2678, Reference 065551-011910.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chinh H. Pham/

Chinh H. Pham, Reg. No. 39,329

Greenberg Traurig, LLP  
One International Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 02110  
Tel.: 617-310-6000  
Fax: 617-310-6001